

Remarks

The Office Action rejected claims 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action also rejected claims 39, 42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,872,909 to Wilner, et al. ("Wilner"). The Office Action also rejected claims 1-4, 19, 20, 30, 32-36, 40, 41, 43, 46, 47, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of U.S. Patent Publication 20020083217 to Ward, et al. ("Ward"). The Office Action also rejected claims 10, 12-14, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of U.S. Patent 6,742,143 to Kaler, et al. ("Kaler"). The Office Action also rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Kaler and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,611, 498 to Baker et al. ("Baker"). The Office Action also rejected claims 5-9, 31, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Ward and further in view of Kaler. The Office Action also rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Kaler and further in view of Ward. The Office Action also rejected claims 23-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Baker. The Office Action also rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Baker and further in view of Kaler. The Office Action also rejected claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Ward and further in view of Baker.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 19, 30, 39, and 46. Applicants do not surrender any equivalents of any amended limitations or elements of the amended claims. However, Applicants have not added or canceled any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-20 and 23-50 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Rejection of Claims 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 46-50 under §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In rejecting these claims, the Office Action stated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation of “said event analysis mechanism” in claim 46.

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for noticing the antecedent error. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 46 so that there is proper antecedent for the recitation of “said event analysis mechanism”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 46-50.

II. Claims 1-9, 19, 20, and 30-38

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Ward. Claims 2-9 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method. For an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, the method creates an event object that occupies a memory space which is independent of the application. The method logs within the event object a start time, end time, and information regarding the event. The method analyzes at least one of the start time, end time, and information regarding the event. The creating, logging, and analyzing are performed by an even logging mechanism running independently from the application on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest all claim limitations to make claim 1 unpatentable. For instance, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose an event logging mechanism that performs the creating, logging, and reviewing on a single computer on which an application executes.

In rejecting this features, the Office Action cited Wilner. However, Wilner does not disclose an event logging mechanism that performs the creating, logging, and analyzing on a single computer on which an application executes. Instead, Wilner describes a “target application” that goes into logging mode to perform the logging. *See* column 9, lines 9-14. Specifically, Wilner states that the “target application” stores information in the log buffer each time an event occurs. Wilner further describes a “host program” that reads the information in order to reconstruct the real-time status of the “target application”. However, the “host program” or the “target application” do not perform the creating, logging, and reviewing on a single computer, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 1 unpatentable. As claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-9 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 1.

Furthermore, the Office Action rejected claims 19 and 30 under a similar rationale as claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those as discussed above for claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19 and 30 are patentable over the cited references. As claims 20 and 31-38 depend directly or indirectly on claims 19 or 30, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20 and 31-38 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9, 19, 20, and 30-38.

II. Claims 10-18

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Kaler. Claims 11-18 depend directly or indirectly on claim 10. Claim 10 recites a computer that includes a computer readable storage. The computer readable storage stores a

foundational layer upon which applications are built or executed. The computer readable storage stores an event logging mechanism created by the foundational layer. The event logging mechanism executes independently of the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of events for an application executing on the foundational layer, generating an event log for the application, and analyzing the event log. The event log is generated without referencing any event logs of the application. Each of the events is designated an enabled/disabled status, where a disabled status disables all logging for an event. The event logging mechanism performs the identifying, generating, and analyzing on the computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest all claim limitations to make claim 10 unpatentable. For instance, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose an event logging mechanism for identifying a set of events and generating an event log for the application, without referencing any event logs of the application. In rejecting these features, the Office Action cited Wilner. However, Wilner does not disclose the event logging mechanism as recited.

Instead, Wilner describes a “target application” that goes into logging mode to perform the logging. *See* column 9, lines 9-14. In describing this, Wilner states that the “target application” stores information in the log buffer each time an event occurs. Wilner further describes a “host program” that reads the information in order to reconstruct the real-time status of the “target application”. However, the “host program” or the “target application” do not identify a set of events and generate an event log for an application, without referencing any event logs of the application, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 10 unpatentable. As claims 11-18 are dependent on claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-18 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed

above in relation to claim 10. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-18.

IV. Claims 23-29

The Office Action rejected claim 23 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Baker. Claims 24-29 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 23. Claim 23 recites a computer that includes a computer readable storage. The computer readable storage is for storing a foundational layer upon which applications are executed. The computer readable storage is for storing an event-logging mechanism for execution on the foundational layer. The mechanism executes independently of the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of events for an application executing on the foundational layer, and generating a hierarchical event log for display in a web browser. The event log is generated without referencing any event logs of the application and includes an event in the hierarchy that includes a sub-event. The event-logging mechanism performs the identifying and generating on the computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the computer readable of claim 23. For instance, the cited references do not disclose an event-logging mechanism for identifying a set of events and generating a hierarchical event log, without referencing any event logs of an application. The Office Action cited Wilner as disclosing these features. However, Wilner does not disclose the event logging mechanism as recited. Wilner describes a “target application” that goes into logging mode to perform the logging and a “host program” that reads the information in order to reconstruct the real-time status of the “target application”. However, the “host program” or the “target application” do not identify a set of events and generate a hierarchical event log, without referencing any event logs of an application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 23 unpatentable. As claims 24-29 are dependent on claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-29 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 23. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23-29.

VII. Claims 39-41

The Office Action rejected claim 39 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Wilner. Claims 40 and 41 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 39. Claim 39 recites a method of logging events for an application. The method identifies a set of events generated by the application. The method hierarchically logs the identified set of events. At least one event in the hierarchy includes a sub-event. The identifying and the logging are performed by an event logging mechanism running independently from the application on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wilner does not disclose all claim limitations to anticipate the method of claim 39. For instance, Wilner does not disclose an event logging mechanism that performs the recited identifying and hierarchical logging, where the operations are performed by an event logging mechanism running independently from the application on a single computer on which the application executes. By contrast, Wilner describes a “target application” that goes into logging mode to perform the logging. *See* column 9, lines 9-14. Wilner further describes a “host program” that reads the information in order to reconstruct the real-time status of the “target application”. However, the “host program” or the “target application” do not perform the identifying and hierarchical logging, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 30 unpatentable. As claims 31-38 are dependent on claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that

claims 31-38 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 30. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31-38.

IX. Claims 42-45

The Office Action rejected claim 42 under §102(b) as being anticipated by Wilner. Claim 42 recites a computer includes a storage. The storage is for a foundational layer upon which applications are executed. The storage is for an event-logging mechanism for execution on the foundational layer, for functioning interoperably with but separately from the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of event data for an application executing on the foundational layer, generating an event log to record the identified event data, and analyzing the event data. The application does not generate an event log.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wilner does not disclose all claim limitations to anticipate the computer of claim 42. For instance, Wilner does not disclose a mechanism for identifying a set of event data for an application executing on the foundational layer, generating an event log to record the identified event data, and analyzing the event data, where the application does not generate an event log. Instead, Wilner describes a “target application” that goes into logging mode to perform the logging, and “host program” that reads the information in order to reconstruct the real-time status of the “target application”.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Wilner does not render claim 42 unpatentable. As claims 43-45 are dependent on claim 42, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 43-45 are patentable over the cited references at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 42. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 43-45.

IX. Claims 46-50

The Office Action rejected claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Ward. Claims 47-50 depend directly or indirectly on claim 46. Claim 46 recites a method. The method identifies a set of events that has not been logged by an application. The method analyzes the set of events identified for the application. Each event includes at least a start time and an end time. The method groups the set of events based on the analysis of the set of events. The method generates a display of the set of events based on the grouping. The identifying, analyzing, grouping, and generating are performed by an event analysis mechanism running on a single computer on which the application runs. The event analysis mechanism runs independently from the application on the computer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest all claim limitations to make claim 46 unpatentable. For instance, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose an event analysis mechanism that performs identifying, analyzing, grouping, and generating on a single computer on which an application runs. In rejecting these features, the Office Action cited Wilner. Wilner describes a “target application” that goes into logging mode to perform the logging. *See* column 9, lines 9-14. Wilner further describes a “host program” that reads the information in order to reconstruct the real-time status of the “target application”. However, the “host program” or the “target application” do not perform the identifying, analyzing, grouping, and generating, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 46 unpatentable. As claims 47-50 are dependent on claim 46, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 47-50 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 46. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 46-50.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims, namely claims 1-20 and 23-50 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Applicants have submitted the fees for the petition for the extension of time. Applicants believe that no additional fee is required for the submission of this amendment and response. However, in the unlikely event that the Commissioner determines that additional fee, extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time. Moreover, Applicants authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 50-3804** referencing **APLE.P0005**.

Respectfully submitted,

ADELI & TOLLEN LLP

Dated: November 25, 2008

/Bum Pak/

Bum Pak

Reg. No. 56,916

Adeli & Tollen LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1360
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2514
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x305
Fax: (310) 785-9558